

if we submit a totally balanced budget with certainly a worthwhile goal, there still is going to be some cuts somewhere probably because the Governor has different spending initiatives than we do. Now, certainly several of the initiatives that he wanted have been taken out already and I...and there's still some to come that I do not know what will happen. But I think we have an obligation for a balanced budget. On the other hand, I know that even if we submit a balanced budget to the Governor, I assume there's going to be some vetoes.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, let me ask you this then, to follow up on that. With some of the A bills that are coming down that are going to be heaped on top of the mainline budget, is there any possibility that, I mean, from your perspective now, do you think those would be the places to make some cuts or do you think we should move some out of the mainline? I mean, I don't want to put you on the spot but I'm just curious as to where you think those cuts needs to be made. I'm...I'm...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, if you're asking my personal opinion, I mean, we all...there's 49 different ideas on how to do it. My personal opinion is that we can move the mainline budget forward pretty much like it is and that's where, of course, we've spent our time for the last 70 days. I would...I will take at least the 6 million and preferably in my mind the 12 million out of the special ed bill. Senator Warner has a bill that we can move forward, LB 325, I think it is, that saves a million dollars. Whether we need the DED bill, Senator Engel's bill, LB 425, could probably go at somewhat lesser a level. Ethanol, hopefully, could stay at the 16, but it could be somewhat lesser, and I think we'd have a balanced budget to submit to the Governor. And I submit to you that he would still take some cuts.

SENATOR VRTISKA: But let me ask you, you know, and in talking about LB 425, and I support 425 because I think that, in fact, although it costs money is also a way to raise revenues in future years and because it does look towards more economic development, employment, etcetera, so I have a difficult time in trying to reduce those kinds of funds back down at the expense of some of the other ongoing programs, and I realize these programs are necessary. I guess my question is, in looking at what Senator Witek has put forth, is there a possibility that some of those could make shifts, could make shifts in their budget in order to accommodate those losses and still not